



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/965,197	11/06/1997	SATOSHI EJIMA	JAO32373	3544

25944 7590 06/22/2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

SAX, STEVEN PAUL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 06/22/2004

17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/965,197

Applicant(s)

EJIMA ET AL.

Examiner

Steven P Sax

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7,9-11,15-22,24,26-28,32-41,43,45-47,51-56,58,60-62,66 and 67 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1-5,7,9-11,15-22,24,26-28,32-41,43,45-47,51-56,58,60-62,66 and 67.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application has been examined. The amendment filed 11/14/01 has now been properly entered and considered.

2. Claims 1-5, 7, 9-11, 15-17, 19-22, 24, 26-28, 32-34, 37-41, 43, 45-47, 51, 53-56, 58, 60-62, and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are: These claims either recite, or are dependent from a claim that recites, n^2 areas in which are placed reduced images that are smaller than $1/n$ height by $1/n$ width, but this does not follow from the specification, or make sense in the description of the invention. For example, the value of n is not given, but this would be necessary. If $n=10$ for example, then this means there are 100 areas, each having images placed therein that are $1/100$ height by $1/100$ width. The feasibility of this is not possible as n gets to an arbitrarily high number. Moreover, although n^2 may give a number of areas, $1/n$ does not describe any unit of distance, and this is another omitted relationship.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to

Art Unit: 2174

be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5, 7, 9-11, 15-17, 18-22, 24, 26-28, 32-41, 43, 45-47, 51, 52-56, 58, 60-62, and 66-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klingler et al (5404316) and Ubillos (5999173)

5. Regarding claim 1, Klingler et al show the information processing apparatus with: storage means for storing a plurality of images and other information data (column 2 lines 35-60), dividing means for dividing a display screen into n^2 areas (Figure 3, Figure 5, column 7 lines 14-50). Reduced images of $1/n$ by $1/n$ dimensions is interpreted to mean the length or width of the screen divided by n , and these images, slightly smaller than that (not taking up the whole area) are placed in the areas (see again Figures 5, 6, and 16, column 8 lines 40-55). Klingler et al do not specifically go into the details of a symbol inside the area to represent the other data, but do mention representing and viewing other data. Furthermore, Ubillos shows putting a symbol in reduced image areas to represent other data, for convenient representation and viewing of other data (Figure 3, 4, 5, column 8 lines 45-65). It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to have this in Klingler et al, because it would provide a convenient way to represent and view other data.

Art Unit: 2174

6. Regarding claim 2, the other information is sound data (Klingler et al column 5 lines 30-45, Ubillos column 5 lines 40-50.)

7. Regarding claim 3, the dividing means divides the screen so that an aspect ratio of the divided display area is equal to an aspect ratio of the designated images (Klingler et al column 7 lines 14-50). Note though that this contradicts the wording of claim 1, but the interpretation is given in paragraph 5.

8. Regarding claim 4, the number of displayed images is greater than $(n-1)^2$ and equal to or less than n^2 (see Klingler et al Figure 3 for example). In this example, $n=3$, and the number of images is 3, which is less than 3^2 which is 9, and greater than $(3-1)^2$ which is 1.

9. Regarding claim 5, n is a natural number, for example 3 (Klingler et al Figure 3).

10. Regarding claim 7, when an image is selected, it occupies the entire screen area (Klingler et al Figure 11).

11. Regarding claim 9, the images are displayed with symbols showing the existence of sound data (Ubillos Figure 3, 4, 5, column 8 lines 45-65) and the obviousness for this is explained in paragraph 5.

Art Unit: 2174

12. Regarding claim 10, when the sound data does not contain an image, the symbol is displayed representing the sound data (Ubillos Figure 8).

13. Regarding claim 11, an image is selected from one of the areas, the image occupies the screen, and the sound data is played (Ubillos, column 9 lines 1-16, and this is the more detailed description of what is combined as explained in paragraph 5.

14. Regarding claim 15, line drawings may be inputted in Ubillos (Figures 1, 3, column 7 lines 5-20). The obviousness to combine this into Klingler et al is the same as that explained in paragraph 5.

15. Regarding claim 16, included is the display means (Klingler et al column 4 lines 30-41).

16. Regarding claim 17, the apparatus has a video camera which also inputs audio data (Klingler et al column.4 lines 36-50).

17. Regarding claim 18, in addition to that mentioned for claim 1, this is interpreted to mean that the images fill the page, but if there are less than the n^2 areas, then they are filled from the upper left corner first and the remaining areas are left blank. See this in Ubillos Figure 11 for example. It would be obvious to a

Art Unit: 2174

person with ordinary skill in the art to have this in Klingler et al, because it would provide a convenient way to view the data.

18. Claims 19-22, 24, 26-28, 32-34 show the same features as claims 1-5, 7, 9-11, 15-17 respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons.

19. Claims 35-36 show the same features as claims 18 and 17 respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons.

20. Claims 37-41, 43, 45-47, 51 show the same features as claims 1-5, 7, 9-11, 15-17 respectively and are rejected for the same reasons.

21. Claims 52 and 67 each show the same features as claim 18 and are rejected for the same reasons as that claim.


22. Claims 53-56, 58, 60-62, 66 show the same features as claims 19-22, 24, 26-28, 32-34 and are rejected for the same reasons.

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven P Sax whose telephone number is 703-305-9582. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30AM - 5:00PM.

Art Unit: 2174

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


STEVEN C. X.
PRIMARY EXAMINER